

Dear Dave,

1/14/92

I do not recall after all these years whether I sent you a copy of the letter I wrote Sheehan of the Christic Institute when I read the incredible affidavit he filed in the case the Supreme Court refused to hear yesterday but myohmy! should he have listened to me!

The enclosed copy of the story includes all references to the decision and Christic.

When I heard that in his efforts to help Abirgman, the reporter, whose wife is named Honey, he was dredging the conspiracy-theorists' swamps I got a copy of that really irrational affidavit, virtually none of personal knowledge, and told him how utterly wrong and dangerous it was.

He did not reply.

The affidavit, if not the case itself, visualized that bombing, aimed at Eden Pastore, as part of a monster plot that included the JFK assassination, and the CIA.

On which he had nothing factual at all and did have the ungenable nutty stuff.

At the time, if I recall correctly, I believed that he had broadened his charges much too much and that this junk was irrelevant in any event, broad as his allegations were.

Official vengeance was under Rule 11. The story makes clear enough what it provides.

Those same DJ people sought a Rule 11 judgement from me.

As I now recall, it was in the field-offices combined case, before that fink of an apology for a judge, John Lewis Smith.

I think they got a relatively small award.

Whice ignored in the belief that they'd have to come out here to collect and would not risk any litigation of it because it was worse than baseless, it was procured on undenied and amply-proven perjury.

What Christic did was frivolous and it was misconduct.

What I did was solidly factual and was the opposite of frivolous.

I suppose that now Rule 11 will be applied with less restraint against those of less or no influence.